

REMARKS

In the aforesaid Office Action, claims 1-13 were examined. No claim has been canceled and no new claim has been added, leaving claims 1-13 for consideration.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by White (U.S. 2,281,899) and by Sweeney (U.S. 6,193,476)

Claim 1 has been amended to make clear that the pump is a differential piston which is axially drivable, and is connected to a dipping piston which is adapted to dip into the reservoir of medium to be transported, the dipping piston being attached to a piston rod extending from the differential piston, the transport line, along with the dipping piston being adapted for insertion into the storage reservoir, the dipping piston being adapted to push the medium through the transport line.

It appears that in White a perforated plug (35) receives fluid from therearound by suction created in a chamber (30) in the plug. The suction is created by a piston (52) moving away from the chamber (30). White does not appear to have a piston which is adapted to dip into a reservoir and to push medium through a transport line. White appears to rely upon suction to draw the medium into the pump.

Similarly, it appears that in Sweeney there is no showing or suggestion of a dipping piston adapted to dip into a reservoir of medium and adapted to push such medium from the reservoir to a transport line.

Accordingly, it appears that claim 1, as amended, should not be deemed anticipated by White or Sweeney. Inasmuch as neither reference suggests a piston adapted to be dipped into a reservoir of medium, it would appear that the matter of claim 1 is not

obvious with respect to White and/or Sweeney and should be deemed allowable.

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Sweeney. Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and is believed to be allowable through dependency.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by White. Claim 3 depends from claim 1 and therefore appears to be allowable through dependency.

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by White. Claim 4 depends from claim 1 and is believed to be allowable at least through dependency. In addition, claim 4 makes clear that the dipping piston is insertable into the storage reservoir, a feature not shown or suggested by White.

Claim 5 depends from claim 4 and appears to be allowable by way of dependency.

Claim 6 stands objected to but was deemed to include patentable matter. Claim 6 depended from claim 5, which depended from claim 4, which depended from claim 1. Amended claim 6 includes the matter of claims 1, 4, 5 and 6, and is believed to be in allowable condition.

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over White in view of Alaze (U.S. 6,267,569). Claim 7 depends from claim 1. It appears the Alaze fails to provide a showing or a suggestion of the matter of claim 1. Accordingly, it appears that claim 7 should be deemed allowable through dependency.

Claim 8 stands objected to but was deemed to include allowable matter. Claim 8 depended from claim 1 and has now been

amended to include matter of old claim 1. Accordingly, claim 8 appears to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 9 was similarly objected to. Claim 9 depends from claim 8 and is believed to be allowable.

Claim 10 stands objected to but was deemed to contain allowable matter. Claim 10 has been amended to include the matter of old claim 1 and would appear to have thereby been rendered allowable.

Claim 11 was similarly objected but now depends from amended claim 10 and is believed to be in allowable condition.

Claims 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sweeney. Claims 12 and 13 both depend from current claim 1, which is believed to distinguish over Sweeney. It is therefore believed that claims 12 and 13 are now allowable.

In the course of amending the claims in the case, an effort was made to improve form and antecedent usage. Thus, when it is said that old claim 8 has been combined with old claim 13, such combination was not done literally, but rather with hopefully improved language.

It is noted that new formal drawings are required and shall be provided shortly.

It is further noted that the application was filed with the title "Piston Pump for Viscous Materials", and some formal papers were submitted with the title "Piston Pump For High Viscosity Materials", which has also been used in recent communications from this office. The Official Filing Receipt has the title of "Piston Pump For High Viscous Materials". It is unclear how to correct this, and Attorney for Applicant requests that the title

be amended, if necessary, by Examiner to be "Piston Pump For High Viscosity Materials".

In the event that any fees may be required to be paid in connection with this submission, please charge the same to Deposit Account No. 16-0221.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Scott R. Foster". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Scott" and last name "Foster" clearly distinguishable.

Scott R. Foster

Registration No. 20,570

Pandiscio & Pandiscio, P.C.

470 Totten Pond Road

Waltham, MA 02451-1914

Tel. No. (781) 290-0060

JC/ENGEL36.AMD